



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Applicant | Westlands Water District | County | Kings |
| Project Title | Well Metering Project | Grant Request | \$ 250,000.00 |
| | | Total Project Cost | \$ 404,500.00 |

Project Description: The Proposal installs the remaining 6 percent of the groundwater meters within the District and repairs or replaces existing meters that are no longer functional, as well as installs devices to improve accuracy.

Evaluation Summary:

| Scoring Criterion | Score |
|--|-----------|
| GWMP or Program | 5 |
| Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed | 3 |
| Work Plan | 8 |
| Budget | 4 |
| Schedule | 3 |
| QA/QC | 3 |
| Past Performance | 4 |
| Geographical Balance | 0 |
| Total Score | 30 |

- **GWMP or Program:** On September 16, 1996, the Westlands Water District Board approved Resolution No. 112-96, and adopted a Groundwater Management Plan. The application contains the Resolution as well as a signed document certifying the Resolution was adopted and is in effect.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Background information on existing conditions is contained in the project Description, including a map of Westlands Water District; formation and history of the District; descriptions of existing water meters, pipelines and other infrastructure; number of wells; groundwater use primarily for irrigation; groundwater hydrology and characterization; and conjunctive use. However, the Description lacks a complete and detailed description of the proposed project, except that meters are required. The Description is not clear on how the project would generate a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge, nor describes a process for information dissemination to groundwater users, stakeholders, and the public. The goal of the proposal is not clearly stated, only the overall goal of the District to assume responsibility for operations of all groundwater meters within the District (page PD-5). Aside from participation in CASGEM, the Applicant does not mention collaboration with other local public agencies.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. There is enough detail to show that the project is technically feasible; however the tasks in the Work Plan need more delineation into discrete tasks to serve as the scope of work for the agreement. The Work Plan states that “no permitting or environmental compliance will be necessary.” There could be a brief discussion of why this might be true. The Applicant does not make clear that access to wells would be granted in all cases. The Work Plan task items do not correspond directly with those in the Budget and Schedule. For evaluating the metering project’s progress and performance, the Work Plan lists quarterly progress reports to “the Directors of the LGA Program.” It is not clear whether this refers to DWR or Westlands WD.
- **Budget:** The Budget generally agrees with the Work Plan and the Schedule. There is explanatory text and supporting information for the basis of the labor costs and well installation estimates, but no job titles, hourly rates, or sample quotes. The task names are not numbered consistently in the budget compared with the schedule. No quarterly or final report subtask budget information is presented.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The start date is 04/2013, and the end date is 04/2015, within the PSP guidelines. The Applicant states they will be ready to proceed when funding becomes available. The schedule category names are not consistent with the Work Plan task names or Budget category names. There are no task items for quarterly or final report production. There was no description of potential obstacles to project completion, nor how they would be resolved to keep on schedule.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is not fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The basic elements of a QA/QC plan are described in very general terms. Although the Applicant mentions the existence of meter maintenance and a “program for installation, upgrading, and repair” (page QA-2), specifics sufficiently describing the program are lacking. Although the Applicant states that “qualified and knowledgeable staff” (page QA-2) of Westlands Water District will perform the work, with the exception that “certified welders will be used when necessary,” no description of District staff or their experience and qualifications is given.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant states that an AB 303 grant was completed on time and on budget, and provides a supporting attachment indicating that comparable work was completed. The supporting attachments also included a 2001 Local Groundwater Assistance Grant final report. However, the supporting information does not provide corroboration that the work was completed satisfactorily on schedule and within budget.